

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 and 18-25 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8-9, 11, 13, and 16 are amended. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 8 and 16 have been amended to address the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wiens et al. (herinafter "Wiens"), U.S. Patent No. 4,967,296. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a folded portion in the form of a portion of the cable main body folded so that opposing faces are in contact with each other. This amendment is to clarify that the folded portion is a structural feature of independent claim 1 and not a product-by-process feature. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Wiens at least does not disclose or suggest this feature. Rather, Wiens discloses a printed circuit cable (PCC) a portion of which is supported on a support bracket 60. Further, Wiens does not disclose or suggest the claimed combination of independent claim 1. Independent claims 9 and 11 have been similarly amended. Accordingly, these claims also define over Wiens.

Amdt. dated August 22, 2007

Reply to Office Action of May 24, 2007

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1, 9, and 11 over Wiens should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 7-8, 10, and 12 are allowable over Wiens at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 11, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 13-16 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiens. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 13 has been amended in a similar fashion to independent claims 1, 9, and 11, and thus also defines over Wiens. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 13 over Wiens should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 14-16 and 23-25 are allowable over Wiens at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 13, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 4-6, 18, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (hereinafter “Schultz”), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0043508, in view of Wiens. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 2, 4-6, 18, and 20-22 define over Wiens in view of respective their dependency on independent claims 1 and 13, as well as for their added features. Further, Schultz also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed folded portion of independent claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 2, 4-6, 18, and 20-22 over Shultz and Wiens should be withdrawn.

Serial No. **10/786,309**
Amdt. dated August 22, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 24, 2007

Docket No. **IK-0062**

The Office Action rejected claims 3 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shultz in view of Wiens and further in view of Takahashi et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/025785. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Shultz and Wiens fail to disclose the claimed folded portion as discussed above. Takahashi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Shultz and Wiens, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching an adhesive member. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 3 and 19 over Shultz, Wiens, and Takahashi should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **10/786,309**

Amdt. dated August 22, 2007

Reply to Office Action of May 24, 2007

Docket No. **IK-0062**

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



John C. Eisenhart
Registration No. 38,128

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

(703) 766-3777 CLD/JCEdg

Date: August 22, 2007

\\Fk4\Documents\2047\2047-059\126107.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610